



## **ELSI 2.0 Publications/Authorship Policy/Credit**

ELSI 2.0 is designed to accelerate and enhance collaboration between individuals and groups working internationally on issues at the intersection of ethics and genomics. It is expected that the products of such collaborations will come in many forms including journal publications, monographs, grant applications, policy documents and a variety of social media and networking. For reasons that should be obvious, ELSI 2.0 should strive not only to meet high standards for publication but to set a standard for transparency and excellence. At the same time, ELSI 2.0 is designed as a virtual organization with an informal rather than formal administrative structure so it must be careful not to impose overly bureaucratic policies that might stifle the very creativity and collaboration it was designed to promote.

Therefore, among the issues that ELSI 2.0 intends to clarify with this document are the conditions under which the “ELSI 2.0” name would be used in publications (and perhaps grant applications, funding proposals to philanthropies/charities), and what role if any ELSI 2.0 itself has in vetting such documents. In particular:

- when, if ever, is it appropriate for a publication to be authored “by” or “on behalf of” or “as members of” the ELSI 2.0 organization and how would this occur?;
- when is it appropriate for ELSI 2.0 to be “acknowledged” as an accelerant, or capacity builder, convener, or source of funding?

Such clarifications are valuable to avoid confusion and head off hurt feelings, but they also provide a mechanism for collecting data about the impact of ELSI 2.0 (number of publications) that may be of value for other purposes.

Below we outline several scenarios which may capture situations in which the authorship issue would arise.

## Categories, Scenarios, and Procedures

### 1. Benefitting from ELSI 2.0

Scenario 1.1: One or more ELSI 2.0 Collaboratory members seek out the Collaboratory for its research expertise, and, upon obtaining it, prepare and submit a manuscript to a journal about a topic of their own choosing and expertise. They work at their home institutions, receive funding from a variety of sources, but have prepared a manuscript that benefitted from their participation in the ELSI 2.0 Collaboratory (e.g., they met “online”). Arguably then, but for the Collaboratory, the paper might never have come to fruition.

- The manuscript would follow normal professional authorship standards, e.g. those of the ICMJE ([http://www.icmje.org/ethical\\_1author.html](http://www.icmje.org/ethical_1author.html)) regarding substantive contributions, etc,
- The authorship list would identify individuals by their home institutions consistent and in an order consistent with contribution, etc
- The manuscript would include a statement that acknowledged the ELSI 2.0 role (in much the same way that acknowledgement credit is given in other manuscripts). A boiler-plate phrase would be developed.
- Prior to submission the manuscript would be submitted to the ELSI 2.0 “Publications Committee” (see below) for their information

Scenario 1.2. A group of ELSI 2.0 collaborators is asked to undertake (or takes it upon themselves to undertake) a study that evaluates the impact of the ELSI 2.0 Collaboratory on innovation. They organize themselves as a “team”, and perhaps have secured funding through the ELSI 2.0 “accelerator”. The study, in other words is being done by ELSI 2.0 collaborators on ELSI 2.0 itself.

- The manuscript would follow normal professional authorship standards, e.g. those of the ICMJE ([http://www.icmje.org/ethical\\_1author.html](http://www.icmje.org/ethical_1author.html)) as above,
- The manuscript would include a statement that acknowledged the ELSI 2.0 role (as above)
- The authorship list could include the names and institutional affiliations of the members, and would also include a phrase such as “and the ELSI 2.0 Working Group on Innovation”, the name of which would have been established in advance.
- The manuscript would be submitted to the ELSI 2.0 “Publications Committee” for comment, but not approval.

Scenario 2.3: Members of the H3Africa “discussion room”, engage in a spirited online conversation about GWAS studies in South Africa, with no particular intention to publish, until one especially enthusiastic member suggests that “we should write this up and submit it for publication”. It would be in this context that author would be writing “as members of ELSI 2.0” but not “on behalf of ELSI 2.0”.

- The co-moderators would be responsible for recognizing when a conversation becomes a possible manuscript-to-be and facilitates a discussion
  - Scenario similar to 1.1 above.
  - The manuscript would be submitted to the ELSI 2.0 “Publications Committee” for comment
2. “Speaking on behalf of ELSI 2.0”

Scenario 2.1: The Steering Committee would like to update the *Science* paper from 2011 with new data, new information, and a new analysis. All members of the Steering Committee are prepared to contribute to the paper, as they did in the initial publication. The paper further proposes “next steps” in the evolution of ELSI 2.0.

- The manuscript would follow normal professional authorship standards, e.g. those of the ICMJE ([http://www.icmje.org/ethical\\_1author.html](http://www.icmje.org/ethical_1author.html)) as above,
- The authorship list could include the names and institutional affiliations of the members, and would also include a phrase such as “on behalf of the ELSI 2.0 Collaboratory”.
- The manuscript would be submitted to the ELSI 2.0 “Publications Committee” for comment, but not approval.

Scenario 2.2 Two members of the original steering committee would like to publish a paper critiquing some aspect of the Collaboratory that they find troubling. No other member of the Steering Committee holds these views, but all members support the principle of academic freedom.

- The manuscript would follow normal professional authorship standards, e.g. those of the ICMJE ([http://www.icmje.org/ethical\\_1author.html](http://www.icmje.org/ethical_1author.html)) as above,
- The authorship list could include the names and institutional affiliations of the members, but would not include a phrase such as “on behalf of the ELSI 2.0 Collaboratory”.
- The manuscript would be submitted to the ELSI 2.0 “Publications Committee” for comment, and approval.

### **Publication Committee**

Many organizations now have publications committees, consisting of members who from time to time rotate on and off the committee and whose role is to review, comment on and in some instances approve publications. The rationale for such a committee is as follows:

- It is a useful way of tracking the number and quality of publications that are produced which can be valuable in future grant applications, or proposals to philanthropies/charities
- It is a helpful service to authors

Current as of: June 5, 2013

The mission of the committee would be limited to (a) receiving and being informed of papers that were written with some connection to ELSI 2.0, and (b) commenting as appropriate on papers, and (c) only in cases where a paper is written “on behalf of ELSI 2.0” would the committee provide approval. Membership would include some current steering committee members and other at-large members selected from amongst Collaboratory participants. Membership should not be onerous: individuals would rotate off after a year.